THE COLLINS CENTER UPDATE

Volume 12, Issue 2 January-March 2010



THE CENTER FOR STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE CARLISLE, PENNSYLVANIA



INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- Strategic Decision Making Exercise 2010
- Montenegro: Strategic Defense Review
- War is War: Cyberspace Operations in the Contemporary Operational Environment
- The Complexity of International Diplomacy
- Strategic Force Planning and Development in the Armed Forces of Bosnia and Herzegovina

STRATEGIC DECISION MAKING EXERCISE 2010

Colonel John Laganelli

Director, Strategic Decision Making Exercise, CSL

From 3 through 10 March 2010, the U.S. Army War College (USAWC) resident class participated in the Strategic Decision Making Exercise 2010 (SDME 10), a faculty-led political-military decision-making exercise designed to provide students the opportunity, while role-playing strategic leaders and staffs, to integrate and apply knowledge acquired in the USAWC core curriculum. 2010 marks the sixteenth iteration of this premier annual capstone learning event.

SDME 10 was a joint and multinational exercise that included political and military play at the high operational and strategic levels, all set in the year 2021. It was intended to place students in a volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous virtual environment, aided by appropriate information technology tools and models, in which they applied service and joint doctrine within the framework of the interagency, military contingency planning and execution, military resourcing, and multinational coordination processes. Students developed strategic policy

recommendations for employment of the diplomatic, informational, military, and economic elements of power, while considering multiple scenarios. The scenarios included major combat operations, lesser contingencies, stability operations, global terrorism, disaster relief, and humanitarian assistance. Crises occurred in every Geographic Combatant Command area of responsibility.

The exercise involved the entire USAWC student body, USAWC staff and faculty members, subject matter experts, and invited guests. Students role-played leaders of selected elements of the interagency community at the strategic level which included the Deputy National Security Advisor, the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, and the Deputy Secretary for Homeland Security. In addition, students assumed military leadership and staff roles across the Geographic Combatant Commands and the Joint and Service staffs. Students engaged in interagency policy and deputies committee meetings to formulate and implement national security policy that involves the use of all elements of national power. During the SDME, they also prepared and presented Congressional testimony, conducted press briefings and short notice interviews with media



Students provide testimony at a mock Congressional hearing during SDME

maintaining the data needed, and c including suggestions for reducing	lection of information is estimated to ompleting and reviewing the collect this burden, to Washington Headqu uld be aware that notwithstanding an DMB control number.	ion of information. Send comments arters Services, Directorate for Info	s regarding this burden estimate ormation Operations and Reports	or any other aspect of the s, 1215 Jefferson Davis	nis collection of information, Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington	
1. REPORT DATE MAR 2010		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-01-2010 to 00-03-2010		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
The Collins Center Update. Volume 12, Issue 2, January-March 2010				5b. GRANT NUMBER		
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
				5e. TASK NUMBER		
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College, Center for Strategic Leadership,650 Wright Avenue, Carlisle, PA,17013				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAII Approved for publ	ABILITY STATEMENT ic release; distributi	on unlimited				
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NO	OTES					
14. ABSTRACT						
15. SUBJECT TERMS						
16. SECURITY CLASSIFIC		17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON		
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified	Same as Report (SAR)	4	TEST CRISIBLE I ENSOR	

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188 representatives, and briefed senior officials from the government, business, military and academic communities.

The exercise was fueled by over three hundred separate student special learning events, including thirty distinguished visitors (flag rank or civilian counterparts) who served as senior role-players and provided direct interaction with the students, one hundred and thirty standup interviews, ten media briefings, eight congressional testimony sessions (four sessions conducted via VTC with actual U.S. Representatives and four conducted with Congressional staffers role-playing Congressmen), forty-nine bilateral negotiation sessions enabled by the USAWC's forty-nine International Fellows, twenty-two VTCs with realworld U.S. Geographic Combatant Commands, and numerous coalition briefings and joint resourcing boards and meetings. One hour in-cell After Action Reviews (AARs) were held on a daily basis and the exercise closed with twenty separate three-hour in-seminar AARs conducted by the USAWC faculty instructors with the students, as well as separate controller AARs.

The preparation and execution of SDME 10 demanded the full attention of the USAWC faculty, which provided up to two observer-controllers per student organization. In addition, representatives from more than thirty U.S. civilian and military organizations and seventy-nine individual reserve component augmentees helped to ensure that the control structure provided a realistic strategic environment.

In summary, SDME 10 was a world class exercise designed to develop mentally agile strategic leaders who are capable of successfully operating in challenging future interagency, intergovernmental and multinational settings. It directly challenged the students to apply their prior experiences and the knowledge they had gained in the first seven months of their studies. Most importantly, it required them to think and make decisions outside their normal comfort zone and to then

understand the probable consequences, second and third order effects of strategic-level decisions.

- CSL ----

MONTENEGRO: STRATEGIC DEFENSE REVIEW

Professor Bernard F. GriffardOperations and Gaming Division, CSL

Established in the 15th century, Montenegro maintained independence from the Ottoman Empire first as a theocracy ruled by bishop princes and later as a secular principality. Existence as a sovereign entity ceased at the close of World War I, when it was absorbed into the confederation that, in 1929, became the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. At the close of World War II, Montenegro became a constituent republic of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). It finally regained its independence in June 2006 when it dissolved the rump Yugoslavia confederation of Serbia and Montenegro.



Professor Griffard (left), VADM Dragan Samardzic, CHOD, and Dr. Nation

Today, as Montenegro approaches its fourth anniversary as an independent nation, it is actively pursuing membership in both the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union (EU). In December 2009, Montenegro was invited to participate in NATO's Membership Action Plan (MAP). MAP is a NATO program of advice, assistance and practical support tailored to the individual needs of countries wishing to join the Alliance. In support of this effort, and under the auspices of the U.S. European

Command (USEUCOM), the U.S. Army War College (USAWC) provided a traveling contact team (TCT) consisting of Dr. R. Craig Nation, Department of National Security & Strategy (DNSS), and Professor Bernard F. Griffard, Center for Strategic Leadership (CSL) to assist in the review of the Montenegrin draft Strategic Defense Review (SDR). The SDR represents a critical step on the road to NATO membership. Previous visits to Montenegro since independence by Professor Griffard (2008) and Dr. Nation (2009) provided important background on the Armed Forces of Montenegro (AFM) transformation and modernization efforts, and had introduced them to some of the key players in the SDR development process.

During the detailed review of the SDR conducted by the Chief of Defense (CHOD), and the First Deputy Defence Minister, the USAWC team recommended consideration of impacts environmental remediation on infrastructure consolidation; and the identification of niche areas that could be developed to make the AFM a more effective security provider within a multinational framework. At the conclusion of the review the Montenegrin planners had refined the draft so that it reflected the national values and goals of the AFM. The finished SDR draft was forwarded to NATO on January 27, 2010.

—— CSL —

WAR IS WAR: CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS IN THE CONTEMPORARY OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Professor Dennis MurphyDirector, Information in Warfare Group, OGD, CSL

The Center for Strategic Leadership's Information in Warfare Group, in partnership with The SecDev Group, conducted a workshop examining cyberspace operations from the warfighter's perspective. The SecDev Group is a think tank based in Ottawa, Canada

focused on emerging security challenges and countries at risk from violence, insecurity and instability.

The workshop was held 26-28 January 2010 at Collins Hall and centered on three themes. The first theme considered the strategic framework from the perspective of defining cyberspace as a domain of military operations, including a consideration of the application of current military doctrine to cyberspace. The second considered situational understanding in terms of how cyberspace operations fit within the warfighting commander's mission set across the full spectrum of conflict; it specifically considered how to gain situational understanding as input to planning and executing joint operations. The final theme considered cyberspace authorities and rules of engagement that determine strategic utility and tactical applicability.

The workshop brought together an international audience of military and national security community and intelligence community leaders as well as experts from academia. It was conducted over the course of three days and began with a plenary session, a keynote presentation, and a dinner speech to set the stage for the subsequent presentations and discussions. Day two included additional plenary presentations to establish a foundation of understanding followed by breakout groups that addressed the key issues involved in order to satisfy workshop objectives. Day three was devoted to briefing the recommendations, observations, and insights gained from the breakout groups to the plenary group and to blue ribbon senior panels in Washington and Ottawa.

An issue paper that includes initial impressions and findings can be found at: http://www.carlisle.army.mil/DIME/documents/War%20is%20War%20 Issue%20Paper%20Final2.pdf.

A complete workshop report will be written by the Center for Strategic Leadership and the SecDev Group in cooperation with workshop participants. Target publication is summer, 2010.

THE COMPLEXITY OF INTERNATIONAL DIPLOMACY

Mr. Ritchie Dion

Operations and Gaming Division, CSL

Over the past ten years, the United States Army War College has conducted the Strategic Crisis Negotiation Exercise, an event that places primary emphasis on understanding the application of negotiations within the diplomatic element of power. This exercise was designed for the Army War College's International Fellows Program. Led by the Army War College's Deputy Commandant for International Affairs, Ambassador Carol van Voorst, this year's exercise was conducted 3-4 February 2010. Within the exercise the International Fellows role-played diplomats and honed their abilities to practice international diplomacy, negotiation techniques and strategic decision making.

The scenario centers on a crisis in the South Caucasus region some ten years in the future, modeled on a real-world situation that began in the late 1980s and continues to fester even to this day with no real solution in sight. The central issue of both the scenario and the real-world situation it is based on regards the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan over the territory known as Nagorno-Karabakh, an ethnic-Armenian area within western Azerbaijan, and efforts to resolve the conflict before a brewing crisis can erupt. Other countries with interests in the region and involved in the negotiations include neighboring Iran and Turkey, regional heavyweight Russia, and the United States. The territory of Nagorno-Karabakh has its own government and represents its own interests. While the scenario is fictional, it closely depicts the real situation in the South Caucasus region, which helps demonstrate to the Fellows the complexity of these types of situations. Prior to each iteration of the exercise the scenario is refined to incorporate improvements and to maintain its close relationship with the actual events in the region.

Prior to the start of the exercise, Professor Charles King, a regional scholar from Georgetown University, provided the students with an historic perspective on the region and discussed the roots of the conflict. Entering into the exercise, the International Fellows were divided between the seven country teams and, in addition to the scenario and other exercise materials, were provided confidential instructions from their governments which spelling out their leader's guidance concerning overarching national interests, guiding principles, desired end-states, and specific negotiation instructions. Each team was assigned a mentor, all of whom are retired U.S. ambassadors with extensive regional experience. All participants agreed that the mentors made a good exercise a great one. Their firsthand knowledge and experience in the region and with negotiating settlements gave all International Fellows a realistic and powerful glimpse at the diplomatic element of power.

Over the next two days the teams attempted to negotiate a resolution to the conflict. The exercise concluded with all teams attending a Ministerial Meeting,



International Fellows from the Russian and Turkish teams conduct a bilateral negotiation

chaired by former U.S. Ambassador Steven Mann acting as the United Nations' Special Representative to the region, which allowed each team to bring their revised positions to the table in an effort to increase the possibilities of a diplomatic breakthrough.

After the exercise the overarching consensus of the Fellows was that this was an important exercise and one of the best academic-based exposures to the diplomatic element of power they had experienced.

- CSL ----

STRATEGIC FORCE
PLANNING AND
DEVELOPMENT IN THE
ARMED FORCES OF BOSNIA
AND HERZEGOVINA

Professor Bernard F. GriffardOperations and Gaming Division, CSL

Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), as it exists today, was created as the result of two negotiated settlements. In 1993, the Washington Agreement ended the conflict between the Croatian Republic of Herzeg-Bosnia and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, forming the

Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In November 1995, the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Dayton Accords) ended the conflict between the Bosnian Serbs and the Federation. As the result of these two internationally refereed settlements, BiH consists of two entities - the Bosniak (Bosnian Muslims) and Croat Federation and the predominantly Serb Republika Srpska - and the Brcko district, an administrative unit still under international supervision. Located in the capital of Sarajevo, the executive branch of this joint, multi-ethnic, evolving federal democratic republic consists of a collective Presidency (one Bosniak, one Croat, and one Serb elected by popular vote for four year terms) as Chief of State and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers as Head of Government.

Standing out as an exception to the ethnic-based politics of the country is the Armed Forces of BiH (AF BiH). Since its formation in December 2005, the AF BiH has made great strides in becoming a truly integrated national military force.

In support of the AF BiH professionalization efforts, the United States European Command (USEUCOM)

utilizes traveling contact teams (TCT) under the auspices of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff's (CJCS) Joint Contact Team Program. As part of its continuing mission to provide support to the Combatant Commanders, the U.S. Army War College (USAWC) conducted a three-day TCT seminar in Sarajevo, BiH, 9-11 February 2010, that addressed Strategic Force Planning and Development. The USAWC team consisted of Professor Bernard F. Griffard and Colonel Samuel R. White, Jr., from the Center for Strategic Leadership (CSL), and Lieutenant Colonel David A. Barsness from the Strategic Studies Institute (SSI).

The TCT focused on increasing the force development expertise of both the BiH Joint Staff (JS) and Ministry of Defense (MOD) personnel. The seminar provided a venue for a professional discussion about the complete process of building and developing force structure on the operational and tactical levels. In accomplishing this goal, the USAWC Team drew on the U.S. Army experience and procedures as well as the organization structure and deployment of forces in accordance with the mission.

This and other CSL publications can be obtained free of charge online at: http://www.csl.army.mil

COTTINS CENLER UPDATE - SPRING 2010

OEEICIYF BOSINESS

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE Center for Strategic Leadership 650 Wright Avenue Carlisle, PA 17013-5049